

thus hardened more and more into dogma and superstition, in spite of the protests of spiritual teachers like Claudius of Turin, or Agobard of Lyons, or John Scotus Erigena, or Ratramnus in the ninth century, until we have the vast fabric of mediaeval church doctrine, polity, and usage established by a Hildebrand, and expounded by the schoolmen. An absolute pope, an infallible church, a priestly caste, a hard and fast system of doctrine, transubstantiation, worship of saints and relics, a degrading materialism in religion, displaced the spiritual and ethical creed of Christ. Thus theology reigned supreme, and philosophy under the guidance of the pseudo-Aristotle had to square with it. The authority of the system excluded all other authority, and relentlessly crushed independent thinking, conscientious objections.

The dialectic drill that passed for science and learning in those haunts of teachers and students, which developed into universities, appears to us a very artificial thing. Its only value consisted in the fact that it at least afforded a mental discipline. It preserved the mind from dying of vacuity. The argumentation of Realist *versus* Nominalist, and *vice versa*, was better than no argumentation, at all, and during the course of this argumentation the attempt was at least made to vindicate to some extent the free exercise of the reason. To this extent, but to this extent only, we may subscribe to the dictum of M. Saint Hilaire and M. Hureau that "the scholastic philosophy was the first insurrection of the modern spirit against authority." Anselm *versus* Roscellinus, Bernard *versus* Abelard, did some service in keeping alive intellectual discussion, especially as Roscellinus, Abelard were the champions of some measure of rationality, and compelled their antagonists to expend a good deal of intellectual energy in order to make good their contention that faith is greater and more imperative than knowledge, that the individual mind must not seek the truth for itself, as the nominalist contended, but submerge itself in the received system of dogma, must implicitly accept the teaching of the Church as irrefragable verities of faith, as the realist demanded. The position of an Anselm might be radically false and misleading. *Non intelligo ut credam^ sed credo ut intelligam*. Faith, not reason, is the true criterion of knowledge. This